



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

from a Spanish life of this saint, accounts of which we have met with.*

St. Philomena is said to have suffered martyrdom on the 10th August, A.D. 286, in the reign of the Emperor Diocletian. She was the daughter of a king who (our author has discovered) reigned at this time over a little state in Greece. Her mother was also of royal lineage. Both her parents were idolaters, and, being childless, never ceased to offer sacrifices to their gods, that they might obtain offspring. Their prayers were long unsuccessful, until a Roman physician named Publius, who resided in their palace, prescribed baptism, and promised them children if they would consent to embrace Christianity. They agreed to the conditions, and on the 10th of January (for we follow an author at no loss about details), obtained, in a daughter, the reward of their faith. She was baptized Philumena, a name, as to the derivation of which we should doubtless mistake, had it not been made the subject of a divine revelation from the saint herself to an Italian nun. It signifies (we are informed by Mr. Duffy) the "friend of light," being derived, apparently from the Greek φίλεω, and the Latin *lumen*, light. Possibly half her name may have been given by her Grecian parents, and the other half, by the Roman physician who had foretold her birth.† Well, Philomena lived very happily with her parents, until she was turned twelve years of age, when her parents brought her to Rome, whether her father was obliged to repair, in order to renew his allegiance to the Emperor Diocletian, who, at that time, threatened Greece with an unjust war. No doubt, secular historians are misinformed when they represent Greece as a peaceable province of Diocletian's empire. No sooner had the emperor seen Philomena than he determined to make the child his empress, and he assured her father, that he might banish from his mind all fear of war; and that in return for the hand of his daughter, he would set all the forces of the empire at his disposal, and confer on him, and on his country, the greatest advantages. The parents, delighted with this proposal, found an unexpected obstacle; and this was, that the pious little girl had taken the precaution to make a vow of perpetual virginity *two years before!* In vain did her father urge that she was too young to contract such an engagement, and persuade her to become an empress, and to seat herself on the greatest throne in the world. In vain did he utter "the most wicked threats." In vain did her parents cast themselves on their knees to her, saying, with tears in their eyes, "Daughter, loved daughter, have pity on thy father, thy mother, thy country, our subjects." "No, no," she replied, "God before father, or mother, or country;" and adhered to her vow with a firmness which plunged her mother into despair.

Her baffled parents handed her over to the emperor, who proceeded to attempt to gain her heart by other methods. The first step of his courtship was to load her with chains and cast her into a dungeon of his palace, where she remained for thirty-nine days (without eating anything, according to the Spanish account), and, strange to say, without being more favourably disposed towards her royal suitor than before. Scourging was the next mode of ingratiating himself which he tried. In the presence of a great number of the officers of his court, he caused her to be so striped, that her bleeding body was soon beaten into one wound. He had her then thrown back into prison, sure that she must die in a few hours, but he was deceived, for two angels poured into her wounds a balsam which, in a moment, perfectly healed them. Diocletian ascribed this cure to his god Jupiter, who, he thought, was determined that Philomena should be his empress; and he endeavoured now, by the highest promises, to bring her to this view of the case—but all in vain. Then ensued an extraordinary conflict between Diocletian, who was determined to destroy Philomena, and the angels, who were determined to protect her; a conflict in which, wonderful to tell, the emperor obtained the victory. First, he ordered his attendants to tie an anchor round her neck, and to cast her into the Tiber; but the angels cut the cord, let the anchor fall into the river, (where it remains to this day), and bore Philomena, on their wings, dry to the bank. Not moved by this failure of his attempt, Diocletian caused her to be dragged through the streets of Rome, and ordered, that a shower of arrows should be discharged at her; and, then, directed her, bruised and dying, and with blood trickling over all her limbs, to be thrown back into her dungeon; but Philomena had good healing flesh, and, after a refreshing sleep, awoke up perfectly well. The emperor, then, ordered the arrow experiment to be repeated in his presence, but this time the bows and arrows were useless, and could not be got to act. He then caused the arrow-heads to be heated in a furnace, and tried again; but now the fiery arrow-heads recoiled on those who shot them—killing six of them, and wounding others. The persevering tyrant next tried beheading. What the

* We do not happen to have met with these foreign little books ourselves, but the Spanish tract is translated by Mr. Meyrick in his "Practical working of the Church of Spain," while accounts of the French one are given by De Potter, (*Histoire du Christianisme*, tom. vi., p. 250), and by Rev. R. Scott, in the appendix to his "Twelve Sermons."

† We notice that the French account makes the saint derive her name "Filia lumen," daughter of light. Mr. Duffy probably saw that the name was obviously Greek, the initial F being only the Italian equivalent for Ph. But what presumption in him to attempt to improve on a divine revelation! At all events our readers will observe that there is precisely the same evidence for these etymological prodigies, as for the other marvels recorded above.

angels were about this time does not appear; one would think that, if they were not resolved to persevere to the end in defeating the tyrant's attempts, it would have been more merciful to allow the saint to die at the first attempt, without putting her to all the torture they reserved her for: but possibly Philomena, like a cat, had a certain number of lives, and when these were exhausted nothing more could be done for her. However this may be, her head was cut off, on Friday, August 10, A.D. 286, about three o'clock in the afternoon.

Our readers need not be shocked, if we cast some contempt upon this story, in our manner of narrating it. We trust, that we should not be guilty of any want of reverence in dealing with the life of a true saint, or in discussing stories of miraculous events, for which there was a scintilla of historical evidence; but, on the present occasion, we are dealing with a pure, religious romance. For where do our readers suppose St. Philomena is first to be heard of, or what is the authority for the legend we have just narrated? We need scarcely say, that it is not to be found in Eusebius, or any of the ancient ecclesiastical histories. Our readers will search, in vain, for it among any of the collections of acts of martyrs; or among the stories of Simeon Metaphrastes; nor does the name of Philomena occur among the saints, whose lives are given in the voluminous collection of Bolland. It is not pretended that the legend we have given, can lay claim to much more than twenty years' antiquity!!

In the year 1803, Francis de Lucia, a priest of the kingdom of Naples, came to Rome, in search of relics, for the use of his church, at Mugnano del Cardinale, about six leagues from Naples, and was supplied with bones from that fertile source, the catacombs of Rome. The Roman Catholic narrators of the life of St. Philomena, tell us that in the place where these bones were found, was the following fragment of an inscription:—

"... *Lumena Pax tecum Fl.* . . ."

The bones were removed to Mugnano, and, if we are to believe Mr. Duffy, at once commenced performing miracles, of which he only mentions one, we suppose the most remarkable, "copious showers of rain," which were absolutely necessary (and, perhaps, not very surprising) "after long-continued heats."

But all this time the good priest, Francis de Lucia, had the discomfort that the saint who adorned his church was anonymous, and that he knew nothing of her history. His ingenuity soon overcame the first defect: he remembered that some eastern nations read their letters from right to left; it is true, the inscription we have given does not become more intelligible if read backwards—"If mucet xp̄ anomel." However, a compromise might be made between the eastern and western ways of writing, by putting the last syllable first, and so he got for his saint the pretty name of Filumena, or—as they have it in France—Philomène. Still her history remained a mystery, until we are told a workman, a priest, and a Neapolitan nun had revelations on the subject. The story, as we have given it, is in the form in which it was enlarged in the year 1832, by the nun, who, it should be mentioned, was under the spiritual direction of the same priest. The Irish people are assured by Mr. Duffy that these revelations have undergone rigorous examination from "the ecclesiastical authorities, who have pronounced them to bear all the marks by which true revelations are distinguished from false!"

Mr. Duffy, however, abstains from entering into details as to the miracles performed by St. Philomena, some account of which we take from the French life.*

Her first miracle was to paralyze the limbs of the priest who accompanied her relics to Naples, and who had seated himself somewhat irreverently on the chest which contained them. She next played a series of somewhat undignified tricks on those who were preparing a shrine for her. As fast as her measure was taken, she got a few inches longer, so that, says the author, they continually mistrusted some new trick on the part of the amiable providence.

This same shrine, when borne in procession shortly afterwards, though too small for the saint's body, was too large for the lanes through which it had to pass. The difficulty was met, not by a shortening of the shrine, but by a miraculous widening of the lanes! A little afterwards, one of her worshippers, having lain-in of a dead child, loaded the saint with insults, and got rid of her image. St. Philomena harboured no resentment, and raised the child to life. Another time, disputing a soul with the demons, she is said to have pleaded with God in the following terms:— "If this person be not restored to life, I shall be no more honoured (on ne me fêtera plus) in this country, and I am jealous of this honour; I do not wish to be deprived of it."

We shall not pursue our quotations further; enough has been said to show that the process of legend-making and miracle-inventing is not confined to the depth of the dark ages; but goes on with full vigour in the Church of Rome at the present day. But we must not omit to add that Mr. Duffy concludes his story with a prayer:—"St. Philomena, thou lover of innocence, pray for me! Above all things, obtain for me purity—inviolate purity! Obtain for me," &c., &c. We think it mournful at any time to see our fellow-countrymen addressing to departed saints the

* Vie et miracles de Sainte Philomène, vierge et martyre, surnommée la thaumaturge du dix-neuvième siècle, traduit de l'italien sur la 15^e édition, par M. J. F. B. de la Compagnie de Jesus. Approuvé par Mgr. l'évêque de Fribourg. Paris, 1833. Cited by De Potter, as above.

prayers which ought to be offered to our Lord himself; but it is still more shocking to see them taught by their instructors to address their supplications to a being as purely imaginary as Marmion or Don Quixote!

We are favoured occasionally with *anonymous letters*, in which the writers give us the impracticable direction to send them no more numbers of the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*—assigning as their reason their abhorrence of the *lies* with which our pages are filled. We cannot forbear a melancholy smile, as we imagine the writer of such a letter, after having despatched his angry missive through the post against the lying *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, sitting down in simple good faith to study, in the sweet little book enthusiastically recommended to him by the *Freeman's Journal*, the *Tablet*, the *Nation*, and the *Telegraph*, the veracious story of St. Philomena.

HOW FAR THE REFORMATION IS AFFECTED BY THE CHARACTERS AND MOTIVES OF THE REFORMERS.—No. II.

In our last number we made some remarks on the invalidity of the reasoning by which the characters and motives of the Reformers, presumed to have been bad, are converted into an argument against the Reformation itself. We now proceed to show, as we then proposed, that such reasoning, admitted to be valid, may be retorted, with fatal effect, against the Church of Rome.

But there is a general preliminary observation which we desire to make, in order to avoid any misconception of our real views upon this subject. We do not deny, on the contrary we confess, with sorrow, that the Reformation was attended with many excesses on the part of some of those who really abandoned the communion of the Roman Church. We say *really*, because, as is well known, some of the most atrocious crimes which are laid to the charge of the earlier Protestants, both in Germany and England, were committed by, or at the instigation of, secret agents of the Church of Rome, who feigned devotion to the Protestant cause; adopting this—we can scarcely forbear from calling it *infernal*—policy, in order to excite odium against the Reformation. Confining our attention, however, to what we admit to have been genuine Protestant excesses, we assert, fearlessly, that they are not fairly chargeable upon the Reformation, but upon the system against whose corruptions it was the reaction. Every one, who knows anything of human nature and of history, is well aware that it would be impossible, without special miraculous interference, that such a mighty revolution as the Reformation effected, could be brought about without many and lamentable disorders. Men sunk in gross ignorance, intellectual and religious, and degraded by long spiritual slavery, when light suddenly breaks in upon them, and when the pressure of external restraint is abruptly removed, have a natural tendency to rush into the opposite extreme of licentiousness, both of thought and action. The sober and rational enjoyment of liberty, whether of mind or body, is not the work of a day or of an age. It is a thing of slow growth, and requires careful education, and gradual training. As individuals do not attain to the experience and sobriety of manhood, without passing through many preparatory stages, so a people, when suddenly released from the helplessness and dependence of spiritual childhood, do not and cannot at once arrive at spiritual maturity. History teaches us that no great revolution has ever yet been effected without violent excesses on the part of some of those who were engaged in it. And more especially has this been the case in great *religious* movements, wherein all the strongest feelings and passions of our nature are brought into play. Christianity itself formed no exception to the general rule. Our blessed Lord, foreseeing the social convulsions to which it would give occasion, and with a view to anticipate the offence which would thence arise, distinctly said, "Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth; I came not to send peace but the sword."—Matt. x. 34. And the history of the early church informs us that out of the universal agitation and ferment which men's minds then underwent, there sprang, even during the life-time of the apostles, a multitude of wild and fanatical opinions, which threatened the very existence of the infant religion. Who will venture to assert that these attendant evils cast any imputation on the purity and perfection of the Gospel system? And yet, the argument which concludes against the Reformation, from the excesses and abuses to which it gave occasion, might, with nearly the same force, be employed against Christianity itself. When Luther arose, the characteristic doctrines of the Gospel, viz., the utter inability of man to save himself, and the efficacy of faith in the one, perfect, and sufficient atonement of Christ, were well nigh lost. Morality had all but perished from the earth. This is not our assertion, but that of the most devoted partisans of the Church of Rome. Hear, for example, what Bellarmino says, "For some years before the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresies were propounded, there was not (as contemporary authors testify) any security in ecclesiastical judgments, any discipline with regard to morals, any knowledge of sacred literature, any reverence for divine things; there was not almost any religion remaining."* Is it surprising that men born and brought up under such a system, should not, when released from it, exhibit the moderation

* Bellarmino Concilio. xxviii. Oper. tom. vii., col. 296; Colon, 1617.

and soberly which characterize those who have long enjoyed the blessings of rational liberty, morality, and pure religion? So far are the occasional excesses, which unhappily disfigured the revival of religion in the 16th century, from being any real reproach to it, that we unhesitatingly assert they are chargeable on the corruptions which disgraced the mediæval system of Papal Rome. Every generation uttered against the licentiousness of the Reformation recoids with augmented force upon that Church which the intolerable scandals of which outraged humanity at length rose in arms.

So much in reference to the general charges brought against the Reformation, on the score of the heretical opinions and wild excesses of the Anabaptists and other fanatical sectaries. Let us now turn our attention to the special case of the leading Reformers themselves. The principles of the Reformation, it is argued, must be false, because Luther, Calvin, and the rest, were, individually, ungodly men. It is impossible to imagine that God would have permitted such men to be instrumental in reforming his Church, supposing it stood in need of reformation. The scriptural answer to this objection has been already virtually given in our last number. To what was there said we may now add, that the Old Testament furnishes us with a striking example of God's employing, for the reformation of his ancient Church, the agency of a man, who at the very time was committing great sin, and continued to commit it as long as he lived. We allude to the case of Jehu. He destroyed the worshippers of Baal, and executed the divine vengeance on the house of Ahab. But he still upheld the idolatrous worship of the golden calves; that great abomination which is specially designated the sin of Jeroboam. The following words deserve our best attention, as bearing upon the point before us:—"And the Lord said to Jehu: Because thou hast diligently executed that which was right and pleasing in my eyes, and hast done to the house of Ahab according to all that was in my heart: thy children shall sit upon the throne of Israel to the fourth generation. But Jehu took no heed to walk in the law of the Lord the God of Israel with all his heart; for he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, who had made Israel to sin."—4 Kings x. 30, 31. No sin alleged against the Reformers is comparable for enormity to that which Jehu habitually practised. And yet he was a reformer chosen of God. By the special appointment of Jehovah he was anointed king over Israel.—4 Kings ix. 1-3.

But let us admit, as we said before, that the purity of the Protestant faith is vivified by the supposed sinfulness of those who in the sixteenth century promulgated it. This amounts to virtual recognition of the principle that sanctity of life is an essential note of a true Church. Let us, then, examine the result of this principle when applied to the Church of Rome, carefully bearing in mind that this Church boasts that she, and she alone, possesses one attribute of Deity—the attribute of infallibility. It is important also to remember that while (strange as it certainly is) there is no unanimity respecting the seat and organ of that asserted infallibility, the ultramontane Romanists claim it for the successor of St. Peter. The Pope, then, according to the universally received doctrine of the Church of Rome, is the organ of the faith of Christendom; and, according to the most influential party in that Church, he is the infallible organ. In his case, then, if anywhere, we should surely expect to find purity of life as well as purity of doctrine. If the character of the Reformed Churches must be identified with that of Luther and the other Reformers, who claimed no supernatural exemption from human weaknesses, much more must the character of the Church of Rome be involved in that of its infallible rulers. Any reasoning which would justify us in arguing from the unworthiness of the Reformers to the necessary worthlessness of the Reformation, will apply with tenfold force to the wickedness of Popes viewed in connection with the purity of the Church of Rome. Well, then, what do we learn from the inexorable records of Ecclesiastical History? As early as the fourth century Pope Marcellinus, if Pope Nicholas I. is to be believed, terrified, by the fear of death, apostatized from the faith, and sacrificed to heathen idols! The successor of St. Peter, the vicar of Christ, became—an idolater!¹ In the same century, somewhat later, Pope Liberius, weary of banishment, subscribed to the Arian heresy! The successor of St. Peter, the vicar of Christ, became—a heretic!² Poor Cranmer has been branded with every vile epithet that could be thought of, because, when threatened with an agonizing death, he, in a moment of weakness, was induced to renounce the reformed faith: an act which, almost immediately after, he bitterly lamented, and testified his abhorrence of at the stake, by the well-known action which even Voltaire has panegyrized as being more intrepid and magnanimous than that of the ancient Roman. Cranmer's momentary apostacy furnishes rather a dangerous triumph to the advocates of the Church of Rome, so long as the cases of Popes Marcellinus and Liberius stand on record. Cranmer, under the fear of death, abandoned—be it so—the Protestant faith, professing still to be a Christian. Pope Marcellinus, under the same fear, abandoned his God, and sacrificed to idols. Cranmer, to avoid the lingering tortures of fire, subscribed a renunciation of the peculiar doctrines of the Reformation, retaining the com-

mon doctrines of Christianity. Pope Liberius, to escape theodium of banishment, subscribed to the deadly heresy of Arius. Passing over the cases of Pope Anastasius II. in the fifth century, and Pope Vigilius in the sixth, who have both been charged with heresy,³ we next come to Pope Honarius, in the seventh century, who was condemned as a Monothelite heretic by the sixth and seventh general Councils,⁴ and anathematized as such by at least two Popes—viz., Agatho and Leo II.⁵ Leo's words are, "We anathematize also Honarius, who did not enlighten this apostolic church with the doctrine delivered by the Apostles, but attempted to subvert the undefiled faith by profane treachery."

The state of the Roman See during the tenth century, as described by Baronius, the great papal Annaлист, is frightful to contemplate. In his preliminary observations⁶ to the tenth century, he writes thus.—"A new age begins, which, from its asperity and barrenness of good, has been usually called the iron age; from the deformity of its exuberant wickedness, the leaden age; and from its poverty of writers, the dark age. Standing on the threshold of which, we have deemed it necessary to premise something, lest the weak-minded should be at all scandalized if he sometimes should happen to behold the *abomination of desolation standing in the temple*. Scarcely can any one believe what unworthy, foul, execrable, and abominable things the sacred Apostolic See has been compelled to suffer. . . . Oh shame! Oh grief! how many monsters, horrible to be seen, were intruded into that seat which is to be revered even by angels! What tragedies were there enacted! With what filth was it her fate to be besmeared who was herself without spot or wrinkle! With what stench to be infected! With what loathsome impurities to be defiled, and by these to be blackened with eternal infamy!" And, again,⁷ "What was then the face of the Holy Roman Church! How unutterably foul! When harlots, at once most infamous and all-powerful, ruled at Rome; at whose will, Sees were changed, bishops presented, and—what is horrible to hear and utter—their paramours intruded into the chair of Peter." During that tenth century alone, thirty Pontiffs occupied the papal chair, each succeeding one, for the most part, surpassing, if possible, his predecessor in abominable crimes. The mind sickens in reviewing the enormities of these monsters of wickedness. John XII., to select one name from the revolting list, who ascended the papal throne in 956, was convicted by a Roman Synod, convened by the Emperor Otho the Great, of almost every enormity to be found in the catalogue of crime—blasphemy, perjury, profanation, impiety, sacrilege, simony, adultery, incest, murder.

Twenty years later, 974, came Boniface VII., whom Baronius brands as a murderer and a robber. One Roman historian, Cardinal Benno, tells us that in the interval between Pope Sylvester II. and Gregory VII. (999-1073), five of the popes, including these two, were magicians. Platina, the biographer of the popes, goes farther, and says that magic was practised by *all* the popes from Sylvester to Gregory. The heinousness of this practice must not be estimated by reference to our modern notions. It must be remembered that, in the ages under consideration, magic was universally regarded, even by those who practised it, as connected with satanic agency. Of Sylvester, in particular, Platina informs us that, impelled by ambition and a diabolical lust of power, he obtained the pontifical dignity by the assistance of the devil, on the condition of doing homage to the evil spirit, and consigning his soul to everlasting perdition after death. Towards the close of the 15th century, Pope Sixtus IV. occupied the papal chair. He has been charged with unnatural crimes; and it is recorded that he devised a new mode of replenishing the sacred treasury—namely, the establishment of brothels in Rome! It would be superfluous to say a word about Pope Alexander VI. A Romish historian was obliged to combine three of the most atrocious monsters to be found in the annals of Pagan Rome, in order to obtain anything like a parallel to the enormities of Borgia. Nero, Caligula, and Heliogabalus, must be united in order to shadow forth the character of—if it may be said without impiety—this vicar of Christ. His successor, but one, Julius II., scarcely, if at all, fell short of his wickedness. Perjury, poisoning, assassination, drunkenness, unnatural crime, were laid to his charge. He was, moreover, a ferocious and merciless soldier. It was a saying of those times that the earth drank in more blood in a single day, shed through his means, than he himself, and his fellow-revellers, had drunk wine during his whole pontificate. This worthy successor of the Apostles is said, when once leading an army against his enemies, to have flung into the Tiber the keys of St. Peter, with the words—

Cum Petri nihil efficient ad proelia claves,
Auxilio Pauli forsitan euisis erit.

To conclude this dismal retrospect. Some of the infallible depositaries of the Roman Catholic faith were, we are informed by credible witnesses, unbelievers, and even Atheists! Picus Mirandula, who wrote towards the end of the 15th century, tells us of one Pope who, denying that

there was a God, confirmed his miserable impurity by the vile means through which he obtained possession of the papedom, and the equally execrable manner in which he conducted himself as Pope. The same author speaks of another Pope who, while living, declared to one of his friends that he did not believe in the immortality of the soul. But after his death he appeared to the same person, telling him that he had found, to his endless misery and torment, that the soul which he deemed to be perishable was immortal.*

It is with much reluctance that we sally our pages with particulars of this kind. From such revolting details every right-minded man instinctively recoils. To the Christian, jealous for the honour of his most holy faith, such abominations are a source of mingled indignation, shame, and sorrow; while to the infidels they furnish matter for a triumphant scoff, or a malignant sneer. We would willingly consign such dismal records of the past to the oblivion which is their fitting doom; and we would leave those wretched men who disgraced not only the name of Christians but our common humanity, to the judgment of Him whose honour they have impiously blasphemed, and whose eternal laws they have trodden under foot. But controversialists of the stamp of Mr. Keenan will not permit us to do so. They compel us to drag forth from their foul obscurity these deeds of darkness. When they brand the Reformers as heretics, because they dared to quit a communion in which, from the palace of the Vatican to the cell of the monastery, from the Pope to the mendicant friar, and thence through every fibre of the social and religious system, vice and immorality were practised and unblushingly avowed; and withal arrogant to that communion the august epithet of *holy*: when they cast in our teeth the invented crimes of a Luther, a Calvin, and a Cranmer, and exclaim in a tone of malicious triumph—"Behold the apostles of Protestantism! Can the religion be true which had such advocates?" we are obliged, when engaged with those who cannot or will not see the invalidity of such an inference, to retort the argument. And to do so, we are compelled to re-open the polluted pages of history—not *our* historians but their own—and point out to them there, scenes of iniquity perpetrated by the supreme rulers of a Church claiming to be exclusively holy and infallible, before which the vilest accusations which deadly hatred has been able to invent against the Reformers dwindle into utter insignificance.

Let any candid Roman Catholic, of plain common sense, peruse the history of the Popes, and then let him say whether he feels inclined to press the argument against the Reformation from the supposed unworthiness of the Reformers.

THE HEIR OF BALLYMANUS—No. III.

Not long after the meeting with Mr. Oldham, which we recorded in our last chapter, the time of Frank's stay in Rome expired, and he turned his steps homewards. His health and spirits had certainly profited by his travels, but we fear that he had not changed for the better in other respects. He was no longer the sincere and earnest inquirer after truth he once had been. What he had seen on the Continent had convinced him that the religion he there saw developed, contained more of human invention than of revelation from God; yet he sought for nothing purer or better. The disappointment in which his first anxious search for religious truth had ended, had a tendency to give him a distaste for such investigations; while again he was unconsciously influenced by the example of many whom he met abroad, who believed no more than himself, and yet who observed the conformity with the religion of their country, which prudence dictated, only avenging themselves for their compliance by many a bitter jest on it in private. Thus Frank, too, had fallen into a light and careless way of talking on religious subjects; he could enjoy a jest at the expense of the religion he professed; yet, if a serious attack were made on it (by his friend, Graham, for instance), he preferred to turn off the discourse by some sportive answer, rather than encounter the risk of becoming again a prey to those anxious doubts which had once so cruelly disturbed his repose.

When, however, he again set foot on English ground, many slumbering emotions were stirred up. During his year or two of absence, he thought he had taught himself to look calmly back on his acquaintance with Edith, as belonging to a chapter in his life now closed; and when he remembered the tumultuous passions which had then agitated him, it was with such feelings as those with which the traveller, who has escaped one of the fires which sweep over an American prairie, might survey the scene over which the flame had passed, while scarce yet composed from the agitation which he had undergone, and still not fearing that the charred and blackened soil around him could afford materials for such another conflagration. Now, however, as he drew near to London, the feelings which had filled his mind when he had been last there, naturally took possession of it again. While he was abroad, his correspondents had been able to tell him nothing of Edith; and now (useless though, he said to himself, it was to entertain any curiosity regarding one of whom he ought to think no more), he could not refrain from constant speculations—was she then in London? Was it possible he might meet her? How was it likely

* For Anastasius vid. Damas. Pontif. ap. Labbe. tom. v. c. 403, and for Vigilius vid. Liberat. Breviar. cap. 22. Galland. Bib. Pat. tom. xlii. p. 156.

[†] Vid. Labbe. tom. vii. c. 977; tom. viii. c. 1205.

[‡] Vid. Labbe. tom. vii. c. 600, 1156.

[§] Baron. Ann. Eccles. An. 900

^{||} Ann. Eccles. Ann. 912.

* Pic. Mirand. de Fid. et Ord. Cred. Theor. 4.